arXiv:1703.02288v1 [math.DS] 7 Mar 2017

TOWARDS TRACING PROPERTIES ON UNIFORM SPACES

FATEMAH AYATOLLAH ZADEH SHIRAZI, ZAHRA NILI AHMADABADI,
BAHMAN TAHERKHANI, KHOSRO TAJBAKHSH

Abstract. We introduce shadowing (specification property, stroboscopical property) for dynamical systems on uniform space. Our focuses on two classes of dynamical systems: generalized shifts and dynamical systems with Alexandroff compactification of a discrete space as phase space. We prove that for a discrete finite topological space X with at least two elements, a nonempty set Γ and a self–map $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ the generalized shift dynamical system $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varepsilon)$:

- has shadowing property,
- has (almost) weak specification property if and only if $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ does not have any periodic point,
- has (uniform) stroboscopical property if and only if $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one-to-one,
- has strongly stroboscopical property (resp. specification property) if and only if $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one-to-one without any periodic point.

1. Introduction

The notion of shadowing very often appears in several branches of modern theory of dynamical systems [12], and usually plays an important role in the investigation of stability theory and ergodic theory. The main purpose of this paper is to generalize tracing properties to uniform spaces and in particular to compact Hausdorff spaces (one may find similar ideas in [16, 6]).

The action of a group G on metric space (Z, d) is sensitive if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all $x \in Z$ and any open neighbourhood U of x there exists $y \in U$ and $g \in G$ with $d(gx, gy) \geq \epsilon$. T. Ceccherini–Silberstein and M. Coornaert [6] indicate that the action of a group G on a uniform space $(Y, \mathcal{F})$ is sensitive if there exists $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ such that for all $x \in Y$ and any open neighbourhood U of x there exists $y \in U$ and $g \in G$ with $(gx, gy) \notin \alpha$. In this paper we introduce tracing properties for dynamical systems on uniform space .

We realize our generalizations in uniform spaces through two classes of dynamical systems *"generalized shift dynamical systems"* and *"dynamical systems with Alexandroff conpactification of a discrete space as phase space"*. Regarding shadowing property we prove that the generalized shift dynamical system $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$, for a finite discrete X with at least two elements, has always the shadowing property. In addition for a discrete space Y if $A(Y) = Y \cup \{\infty\}$ is one point compactification of Y we prove that the dynamical system $(A(Y), f)$ has shadowing property if and only if one of the following conditions holds:

- $f(\infty) \neq \infty$,

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37B99, 54H20.

Key words and phrases. Fort space, generalized shift, P-chaos, shadowing, specification, stroboscopical.

- $f(\infty) = \infty$ and for all $y \in Y$, $\bigcup\{f^{-n}(y) : n \geq 0\}$ is finite,
- $f^{-1}(\infty) = \{\infty\}$ and for all $y \in Y$, $\{f^n(y) : n \geq 0\}$ is finite.

Also we continue our studies in the above classes on various specification and stroboscopical properties.

2. Preliminaries

Let's recall that for an arbitrary set Y we call the collection $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of $Y \times Y$ a *uniform structure on* Y if :

- $\forall \alpha \in \mathcal{F}\ (\Delta_Y \subseteq \alpha)$;
- $\forall \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{F}\ (\alpha \cap \beta \in \mathcal{F})$;
- $\forall \alpha \in \mathcal{F}\ \exists \beta \in \mathcal{F}\ (\beta \circ \beta^{-1} \subseteq \alpha)$;
- $\forall \alpha \in \mathcal{F}\ \forall \beta \subseteq Y \times Y\ (\alpha \subseteq \beta \Rightarrow \beta \in \mathcal{F})$.

where for $\alpha, \beta \subseteq X \times X$ we have $\alpha^{-1} = \{(y, x) : (x, y) \in \alpha\}$ and $\alpha \circ \beta = \{(x, z) : \exists y\ ((x, y) \in \beta \wedge (y, z) \in \alpha)\}$ also $\Delta_Y = \{(x, x) : x \in Y\}$) [8].

Moreover, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ and $x \in Y$ let $\alpha[x] = \{y \in Y : (x, y) \in \alpha\}$. For uniform structure $\mathcal{F}$ on Y, the collection $\{U \subseteq Y : \forall x \in Y\ \exists \alpha \in \mathcal{F}\ (\alpha[x] \subseteq U)\}$ is a topology on Y, we call it the *uniform topology* induced from $\mathcal{F}$, so accordingly we denote this topological space by uniform topological space $(Y, \mathcal{F})$ whenever we want to emphasize $\mathcal{F}$. We call the topological space Z *uniformizable* if there exists a uniform structure $\mathcal{G}$ in Z such that uniform topology induced from $\mathcal{G}$ coincides with original topology on Z, and in this case we call $\mathcal{G}$ *compatible uniform structure in* Z. Every compact Hausdorff (and in particular, compact metric) space is uniformizable and has a unique compatible uniform structure.
Note to the fact that compact metric space(Z, d) has a unique compatible uniform structure $\{D \subseteq Z \times Z : \exists \kappa > 0\ (\{(x, y) \in Z \times Z : d(x, y) < \kappa\} \subseteq D)\}$.
Now we are ready to define the shadowing property for uniform spaces .

Definition 2.1. For uniform topological space $(Y, \mathcal{F})$, in the dynamical system $((Y, \mathcal{F}), h)$ (or briefly (Y, h)) we say:

- for $\delta \in \mathcal{F}$ the sequence $\{x_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ is a $\delta-$*pseudo orbit*, if for all $i \geq 0$, $(h(x_i), x_{i+1}) \in \delta$,
- for $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{F}$, $x \in Y$ is an $\varepsilon-$*shadowing point* of sequence $\{x_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ if for all $i \geq 0$, $(h^i(x), x_i) \in \varepsilon$,
- the system $((Y, \mathcal{F}), h)$ has *shadowing property* (or *pseudo orbit tracing property*), if for all $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{F}$ there exists $\delta \in \mathcal{F}$ such that every $\delta-$pseudo orbit has an $\varepsilon-$shadowing point in (Y, h).

Whenever Y is compact Hausdorff, since it has a unique compatible uniform structure, shadowing property does not depend on compatible uniform structure used. In particular, for a compact metric space (Y, d), shadowing property does not depend on d and it *works for* all compatible metric on Y.

Similar to the definition of specification properties in metric spaces [7] we have the following definition.

Definition 2.2. For a uniform topological space $(Y, \mathcal{F})$, we say that the dynamical system $((Y, \mathcal{F}), h)$ (or briefly (Y, h)) has *almost weak specification property* if for

all $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ there exists a map $N_\alpha : \mathbb{Z}_+ \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{N_\alpha(n)}{n} = 0$ such that for all $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in Y$ $(n \geq 2)$ and $0 \leq l_1 \leq k_1 < l_2 \leq k_2 < \ldots < l_n \leq k_n$ with $l_{i+1} - k_i \geq N_\alpha(k_{i+1} - l_{i+1})$ (for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$) there exists $x \in Y$ such that

$$(h^i(x), h^i(y_j)) \in \alpha \, \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \forall i \in \{l_j, l_j + 1, \ldots, k_j\} .$$

If in the above definition we suppose in addition that N_α is a constant map (resp. and x is a periodic point of h), then we say that $((Y, \mathcal{F}), h)$ has *weak specification property* (resp. *specification property*).

Let's recall that in the dynamical system (Z, f), for $x \in Z$ and strictly increasing sequence $A = \{n_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ in $\mathbb{N}$ we set $\omega_f(A, x) = \{y \in Z : \{f^{n_i}(x)\}_{i\geq 0}$ has a subsequence converging to $y\}$. Now for definition of various stroboscopical properties see [10].

Definition 2.3. We say that (Z, f) has stroboscopical property (resp. strongly stroboscopical property) if for all $z \in Z$ and every strictly increasing sequence $A = \{n_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ in $\mathbb{N}$, $\{x \in Z : z \in \omega_f(A, x)\}$ is a nonempty (resp. dense) subset of Z. Moreover if $(Z, \mathcal{F})$ is a uniform space and for all strictly increasing sequence $A = \{n_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ in $\mathbb{N}$ there exists a subsequence $B = \{k_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ of A and $\varrho : Z \to Z$ such that the sequence $\{f^{k_i} \circ \varrho\}_{i\geq 0}$ converges uniformly to id_Z, then we say that $((Z, \mathcal{F}), f)$ has uniform stroboscopical property.

Generalized shifts. The one sided shift $\{1, \ldots, k\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{1, \ldots, k\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and two sided shift $\{1, \ldots, k\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to \{1, \ldots, k\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ due to P. Walters [15] have been investigated very well from the ergodic theory nad dynamical systems point of view. For nonempty sets X and Γ and arbitrary map $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$, we call $\sigma_\varphi : X^\Gamma \to X^\Gamma$ with $\sigma_\varphi((x_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Gamma}) = (x_{\varphi(\alpha)})_{\alpha\in\Gamma}$ (for $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Gamma} \in X^\Gamma$), a *generalized shift*. Whenever X is a topological space and X^Γ is equiped with product (pointwise convergence) topology, it's evident that $\sigma_\varphi : X^\Gamma \to X^\Gamma$ is continuous and one may consider dynamical system $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$. Generalized shifts has been introduced for the first time in [3], moreover their dynamical properties have been studied in several texts, like [4] and [9].

Convention 2.4. Suppose that X is a finite discrete topological space with at least two elements, Γ is a nonempty set, and $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is an arbitrary map. For $H \subseteq \Gamma$ let:

$$\alpha_H := \{((x_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Gamma}, (y_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Gamma}) \in X^\Gamma \times X^\Gamma : \forall \alpha \in H \, (x_\alpha = y_\alpha)\} ,$$

so

$$\mathcal{U} := \{D \subseteq X^\Gamma \times X^\Gamma : \text{there exists a finite subset } H \text{ of } \Gamma \text{ with } \alpha_H \subseteq D\}$$

is the unique compatible uniform structure on X^Γ (which is equipped with product topology). Note that, the compact Hausdorff topological space X^Γ is metrizable if and only if Γ is countable.

Alexandroff compactification and Fort spaces. For a topological space Y choose a point $b \notin Y$ and consider the set $A(Y) := Y \cup \{b\}$ with the topology $\{U \subseteq Y : U$ is an open subset of $Y\} \cup \{V \subseteq A(Y) : Y \setminus V$ is a closed compact subset of $Y\}$, then we call $A(Y)$ the *Alexandroff compactification* or *one point compactification of* Y [11, 13]. Obviously one may study a dynamical system with

Alexandroff compactification of a topological space as phase space. Now suppose $b \in F$ and consider F with the topology:

$$\{U \subseteq F : b \notin U \vee (F \setminus U \text{ is finite})\},$$

then we say that F is a *Fort space (with particular point b)* [13, Counterexample 24]. It's evident that the class of Fort spaces is just the class of Alexandroff compactification of discrete spaces.

Convention 2.5. From now on, consider F is a Fort space with the particular point b and $\mathfrak{h} : F \to F$ is continuous. For $H \subseteq F$ let:

$$\gamma_H := ((F \setminus H) \times (F \setminus H)) \cup \Delta_H$$

so

$$\mathcal{K} := \{D \subseteq F \times F : \text{there exists a finite subset } H \text{ of } F \setminus \{b\} \text{ with } \gamma_H \subseteq D\}$$

is the unique compatible uniform structure on F. Note that, the compact Hausdorff topological space F is metrizable if and only if F is countable.

3. Shadowing property

In this section we show that $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has shadowing property (see [14] too). Also we conclude that $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ is P-chaotic if and only if $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one-to-one. On the other hand $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has shadowing property, if and only if one of the following conditions occurs:

- $\mathfrak{h}(b) \neq b$,
- $\mathfrak{h}(b) = b$ and for all $x \in F \setminus \{b\}$, $\bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x) : n \geq 0\}$ is finite,
- $\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(b) = \{b\}$ and for all $x \in F$, $\{\mathfrak{h}^n(x) : n \geq 0\}$ is finite.

Finally, we establish that for a one-to-one $\mathfrak{h} : F \to F$, the dynamical system $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has shadowing property (is P-chaotic) if and only if all elements of F are periodic.

Theorem 3.1. The dynamical system $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has shadowing property.

Proof. For all $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$ there exists $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n \in \Gamma$ such that $\alpha_{\{\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_n\}} \subseteq \alpha$. We show that every $\alpha_{\{\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_n\}}-$pseudo orbit has an $\alpha-$shadowing point, to do this suppose that $\{(x^i_\theta)_{\theta\in\Gamma}\}_{i\geq 0}$ is an $\alpha_{\{\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_n\}}-$pseudo orbit, thus for all $i \geq 0$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}(\sigma_\varphi((x^i_\theta)_{\theta\in\Gamma}), (x^{i+1}_\theta)_{\theta\in\Gamma}) \in \alpha_{\{\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_n\}} &\Rightarrow ((x^i_{\varphi(\theta)})_{\theta\in\Gamma}, (x^{i+1}_\theta)_{\theta\in\Gamma}) \in \alpha_{\{\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_n\}} \\ &\Rightarrow \forall j \in \{1,\ldots,n\}\ (x^i_{\varphi(\beta_j)} = x^{i+1}_{\beta_j}).\end{aligned}$$

Now let let $z := (x^0_\theta)_{\theta\in\Gamma}$. Thus for all $i \geq 0$ and $j \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$ we have $x^i_{\beta_j} = x^{i-1}_{\varphi(\beta_j)} = \cdots = x^0_{\varphi^i(\beta_j)}$, which leads to

$$(\sigma^i_\varphi(z), (x^i_\theta)_{\theta\in\Gamma}) = ((x^0_{\varphi^i(\theta)})_{\theta\in\Gamma}, (x^i_\theta)_{\theta\in\Gamma}) \in \alpha_{\{\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_n\}} \subseteq \alpha\,.$$

Hence z is an $\alpha-$shadowing point of $\{(x^i_\theta)_{\theta\in\Gamma}\}_{i\geq 0}$, and we are done. □

Remark 3.2. For a compact metric space Z we call the dynamical system (Z, f) *P-chaotic* if [1]:

- the collection of periodic points of f is dense in Z,
- the system (Z, f) has pseudo orbit tracing property.

Remark 3.3. The set of periodic points of $\sigma_\varphi : X^\Gamma \to X^\Gamma$ is dense in X^Γ if and only if $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one to one [4, Theorem 2.6]. Also for infinite countable Γ, it is Devaney chaotic if and only if $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one to one without any periodic point [4, Theorem 2.13].
Let's mention that for a compact metric space with no isolated point Z, we say that a continuous map $f : Z \to Z$ (or the dynamical system (Z, f)) is topological transitive if for every nonempty open subsets U, V of Z there exists $n \geq 1$ with $f^n(U) \cap V \neq \varnothing$. And we say taht $f : Z \to Z$ is Devaney chaotic if the set of periodic points of f is dense in Z, $f : Z \to Z$ is topological transitive, and it is sensitive to initial conditions (however this last condition is redundant [5])

Corollary 3.4. The generalized shift dynamical system $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ is P-chaotic if and only if the map $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one to one.

Proof. Use Theorem 3.1 and Remark 3.3. □

Note 3.5. Using Remark 3.3 and Corollary 3.4 if $\eta : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ is one-to-one with at least one periodic point then $(\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \sigma_\eta)$ is not Devaney chaotic although it is P-chaotic (e.g., let $\eta(n) = -n$ $(n \in \mathbb{Z})$. One may compare it with the fact that if the dynamical system (Z, f) with continuum Z is P-chaotic, then it is Devaney chaotic [1] (note that $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is totally disconnected).

Remark 3.6. In Fort spaces Y_1 with particular point b_1 and Y_2 with particular point b_2, $f : Y_1 \to Y_2$ is continuous if and only if one of the following conditions holds true [2, Lemma 5.1]:

- $f(b_1) = b_2$ and $f^{-1}(y)$ is finite, for all $y \in Y_2 \setminus \{b_2\}$,
- $f(b_1) \neq b_2$ and $Y_1 \setminus f^{-1}(f(b_1))$ is finite.

Lemma 3.7. Suppose $\mathfrak{h}(b) \neq b$, A is a nonempty finite subset of $F \setminus \{b\}$ and

$$E := (A \cup \mathfrak{h}(F) \cup (F \setminus \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(\mathfrak{h}(b)))) \setminus \{b\} ,$$

moreover suppose $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a γ_E-pseudo orbit, then:

1. $\mathfrak{h}(F)$ is finite and $\mathfrak{h}(F) \setminus \{b\} \subseteq E$,
2. for $m \geq 0$ if $\mathfrak{h}(x_m) \neq b$, then $\mathfrak{h}(x_m) = x_{m+1}$,
3. for $m \geq 0$ if $\mathfrak{h}(x_m) = b$, then $x_{m+2} = \mathfrak{h}(x_{m+1}) = \mathfrak{h}(b)$,
4. x_0 is an γ_E-shadowing point of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$.

Proof. Note that $F \setminus \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(\mathfrak{h}(b))$ and $\mathfrak{h}(F) = \mathfrak{h}(F \setminus \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(\mathfrak{h}(b))) \cup \{\mathfrak{h}(b)\}$ are finite, since $\mathfrak{h}(b) \neq b$.
2) Consider $m \geq 0$ with $\mathfrak{h}(x_m) \neq b$, so $\mathfrak{h}(x_m) \in E$, using $(\mathfrak{h}(x_m), x_{m+1}) \in \gamma_E$, $\mathfrak{h}(x_m) = x_{m+1}$.
3) Consider $m \geq 0$ with $\mathfrak{h}(x_m) = b$. By $(\mathfrak{h}(x_m), x_{m+1}) \in \gamma_E$ and $\mathfrak{h}(x_m) = b \notin E$ we have $x_{m+1} \notin E$, so $x_{m+1} \notin F \setminus \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(\mathfrak{h}(b))$ and $x_{m+1} \in \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(\mathfrak{h}(b))$, which leads to $\mathfrak{h}(x_{m+1}) = \mathfrak{h}(b)$. Using $\mathfrak{h}(x_{m+1}) = \mathfrak{h}(b) \neq b$ and (2), $\mathfrak{h}(x_{m+1}) = x_{m+2}$.
4) Suppose x_0 is not a γ_E-shadowing point of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$, thus $\{n \geq 0 : (\mathfrak{h}^n(x_0), x_n) \notin \gamma_E\} \neq \varnothing$. Let:

$$p := \min\{n \geq 0 : (\mathfrak{h}^n(x_0), x_n) \notin \gamma_E\} .$$

It's clear that $p \geq 2$, and we have:

$$\mathfrak{h}^p(x_0) \neq x_p \ , \ (\mathfrak{h}^{p-1}(x_0), x_{p-1}) \in \gamma_E \ , \ (\mathfrak{h}^{p-2}(x_0), x_{p-2}) \in \gamma_E .$$

Case I. $\mathfrak{h}^{p-1}(x_0) = b$. By $(\mathfrak{h}^{p-1}(x_0), x_{p-1}) = (b, x_{p-1}) \in \gamma_E$ we have $x_{p-1} \notin E$, so

$x_{p-1} \notin F \setminus \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(\mathfrak{h}(b))$ and $x_{p-1} \in \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(\mathfrak{h}(b))$ hence $\mathfrak{h}(x_{p-1}) = \mathfrak{h}(b) \neq b$. Using (2) , $x_p = \mathfrak{h}(x_{p-1}) = \mathfrak{h}(b) = \mathfrak{h}^p(x_0)$. Thus $(\mathfrak{h}^p(x_0), x_p) = (x_p, x_p) \in \gamma_E$.
Case II. $\mathfrak{h}^{p-1}(x_0) \neq b$. In this case since $\mathfrak{h}^{p-1}(x_0) \in \mathfrak{h}(F) \setminus \{b\} \subseteq E$, and $(\mathfrak{h}^{p-1}(x_0), x_{p-1}) \in \gamma_E$, $\mathfrak{h}^{p-1}(x_0) = x_{p-1}$ which shows $(\mathfrak{h}^p(x_0), x_p) = (\mathfrak{h}(x_{p-1}), x_p) \in \gamma_E$.
Using the above two cases we have $(\mathfrak{h}^p(x_0), x_p) \in \gamma_E$, which is in contradiction with $p \in \{n \geq 0 : (\mathfrak{h}^n(x_0), x_n) \notin \gamma_E\}$. Therefore, x_0 is a γ_E-shadowing point of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$. □

Theorem 3.8. If $\mathfrak{h}(b) \neq b$, then $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has shadowing property.

Proof. Consider $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}$, there exists a finite subset A of $F \setminus \{b\}$ with $\gamma_A \subseteq \alpha$. Let $E := (A \cup \mathfrak{h}(F) \cup (F \setminus \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(\mathfrak{h}(b)))) \setminus \{b\}$ (note that $F \setminus \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(\mathfrak{h}(b))$ is finite), by Lemma 3.7 for all γ_E-pseudo orbit $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$, x_0 is a γ_E-shadowing point of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$. Since $A \subseteq E$ we have $\gamma_E \subseteq \gamma_A \subseteq \alpha$ and x_0 is $\alpha-$shadowing point of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$, which completes the proof. □

Notation 3.9. For $A \subseteq F$ let:

$$A_{\uparrow \text{fin}} := \bigcup \left\{ \{\mathfrak{h}^n(x) : n \geq 0\} : x \in A \cup \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(A) \text{ and } \{\mathfrak{h}^n(x) : n \geq 0\} \text{ is finite} \right\} ,$$

$$A_{\downarrow \text{fin}} := \bigcup \left\{ \bigcup \{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x) : n \geq 0\} : x \in A \text{ and } \bigcup \{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x) : n \geq 0\} \text{ is finite} \right\} .$$

Lemma 3.10. If $\mathfrak{h}(b) = b$, $\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(b)$ has at least two elements, and $F \setminus \{b\} \not\subseteq F_{\downarrow \text{fin}}$, then $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ does not have the shadowing property.

Proof. Consider $x \in F \setminus \{b\}$ such that $\bigcup \{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x) : n \geq 0\}$ is infinite and choose $z \in \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(b) \setminus \{b\}$. If $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has shadowing property, then there exists $\delta \in \mathcal{K}$ such that every $\delta-$pseudo orbit has a $\gamma_{\{x,z\}}-$shadowing point. There exists finite subset A of $F \setminus \{b\}$ such that $\gamma_A \subseteq \delta$. Choose $N \geq 1$ with

$$A \cap (\bigcup \{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x) : n \geq 0\}) \subseteq \bigcup \{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x) : 0 \leq n \leq N\} .$$

For all $m \geq 0$, $\bigcup \{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x) : n \geq 0\}$ is infinite and $\bigcup \{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x) : 0 \leq n \leq m\}$ is finite (since for all $u \in F \setminus \{b\}$, $\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(u)$ is finite), so $\mathfrak{h}^{-(m+1)}(x) \setminus \bigcup \{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x) : 0 \leq n \leq m\} \neq \varnothing$. Choose

$$w \in \mathfrak{h}^{-(N+1)}(x) \setminus \bigcup \{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x) : 0 \leq n \leq N\} .$$

Consider the following sequence:

$$x_0 = z, x_1 = w, x_2 = \mathfrak{h}(w), x_3 = \mathfrak{h}^2(w), \dots ,$$

since $b, w \notin A$ we have $(\mathfrak{h}(x_0), x_1) = (\mathfrak{h}(z), w) = (b, w) \in \gamma_A$ and $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a γ_A-pseudo orbit, so it has a $\gamma_{\{x,z\}}-$shadowing point, say y. Thus for all $i \geq 0$ we have $(\mathfrak{h}^i(y), x_i) \in \gamma_{\{x,z\}}$. In particular $(y, z) = (\mathfrak{h}^0(y), x_0) \in \gamma_{\{x,z\}}$ and $(\mathfrak{h}^{N+2}(y), x) = (\mathfrak{h}^{N+2}(y), \mathfrak{h}_{N+1}(w)) = (\mathfrak{h}^{N+2}(y), x_{N+2}) \in \gamma_{\{x,z\}}$, which leads to $y = z$ and $\mathfrak{h}^{N+2}(y) = x$. Hence $x = \mathfrak{h}^{N+2}(y) = \mathfrak{h}^{N+2}(z) = \mathfrak{h}^{N+1}(b) = b$ which is in contradiction with $x \in F \setminus \{b\}$. Thus $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ does not have shadowing property. □

Lemma 3.11. If $\mathfrak{h}(b) = b$ and $F \setminus \{b\} \subseteq F_{\downarrow \text{fin}}$, then $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has shadowing property.

Proof. Suppose for all $x \in F \setminus \{b\}$, $\bigcup \{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x) : n \geq 0\}$ is a finite and consider $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}$, there exists finite subset A of $F \setminus \{b\}$ with $\gamma_A \subseteq \alpha$. Let

$$E := \bigcup \{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(A) : n \geq 0\} ,$$

hence E is a finite subset of $F \setminus \{b\}$ containing A. We show that every γ_E-pseudo orbit has a γ_E-shadowing point. To do this suppose that $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a γ_E-pseudo orbit. We have the following cases:
Case I. $\{x_n : n \geq 0\} \cap E = \varnothing$. In this case for all $n \geq 0$ we have $x_n \notin E$, moreover $b \notin E$, so $(\mathfrak{h}^n(b), x_n) = (b, x_n) \in \gamma_E$ and b is an $\alpha-$shadowing point of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$.
Case II. $\{x_n : n \geq 0\} \cap E \neq \varnothing$ and $p := \min\{n \geq 0 : x_n \in E\} \geq 1$. In this case $(\mathfrak{h}(x_{p-1}), x_p) \in \gamma_E$, and $\mathfrak{h}(x_{p-1}) = x_p$ since $x_p \in E$. Thus $x_{p-1} \in \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(x_p) \subseteq \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(E) \subseteq E$ which is in contradiction with $p = \min\{n \geq 0 : x_n \in E\}$. So this case does not occur.
Case III. $x_0 \in E$ and $\{n \geq 0 : \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) \neq x_n, x_n \in E\} \neq \varnothing$. Let $p := \min\{n \geq 0 : \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) \neq x_n, x_n \in E\}$, it's clear that $p > 0$. Using $(\mathfrak{h}(x_{p-1}, x_p) \in \gamma_E$ and $x_p \in E$ we have $\mathfrak{h}(x_{p-1}) = x_p$ which leads to $x_{p-1} \in \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(x_p) \subseteq \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(E) \subseteq E$. Since $p - 1 < p = \min\{n \geq 0 : \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) \neq x_n\}$ and $x_{p-1} \in E$, we have $\mathfrak{h}^{p-1}(x_0) = x_{p-1}$. Thus $x_p = \mathfrak{h}(x_{p-1}) = \mathfrak{h}(\mathfrak{h}^{p-1}(x_0)) = \mathfrak{h}^p(x_0)$, which is in contradiction with $p \in \{n \geq 0 : \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) \neq x_n\}$. So this case does not occur.
Case IV. $x_0 \in E$ and $\{n \geq 0 : \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) \neq x_n, \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) \in E\} \neq \varnothing$. Let $p := \min\{n \geq 0 : \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) \neq x_n, \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) \in E\}$, it's clear that $p > 0$. Using $(\mathfrak{h}^p(x_0), x_p) = (\mathfrak{h}(x_{p-1}), x_p) \in \gamma_E$ and $\mathfrak{h}^p(x_0) \in E$ we have $\mathfrak{h}^p(x_0) = x_p$ which is in contradiction with $p \in \min\{n \geq 0 : \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) \neq x_n, \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) \in E\}$. So this case does not occur.
Case V. $\{x_n : n \geq 0\} \cap E \neq \varnothing$. Using Case II, we have $x_0 \in E$. Using Cases III and IV,

$$\{n \geq 0 : \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) \neq x_n, x_n \in E\} = \{n \geq 0 : \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) \neq x_n, \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) \in E\} = \varnothing\,.$$

So for all $n \geq 0$ we have:

$$(x_n \in E \vee \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) \in E) \Rightarrow (x_n = \mathfrak{h}^n(x_0))\,.$$

Therefore $(\mathfrak{h}^n(x_0), x_n) \in \gamma_E$ for all $n \geq 0$ and x_0 is a γ_E-shadowing point of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$.
By the above cases $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ has a γ_E-shadowing point, using $\gamma_E \subseteq \gamma_A \subseteq \alpha$, it has an $\alpha-$shadowing point, which completes the proof. □

Theorem 3.12. Suppose $\mathfrak{h}(b) = b$ and $\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(b)$ has at least two elements. The dynamical system $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has shadowing property if and only if $F \setminus \{b\} \subseteq F_{\downarrow \mathrm{fin}}$.

Proof. Use Lemmas 3.10 and 3.11. □

Lemma 3.13. If $\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(b) = \{b\}$, $F \setminus \{b\} \not\subseteq F_{\downarrow \mathrm{fin}}$ and $F \setminus \{b\} \not\subseteq F_{\uparrow \mathrm{fin}}$, then $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ does not satisfy the shadowing property.

Proof. Choose $x, y \in F \setminus \{b\}$ such that $\{\mathfrak{h}^n(x) : n \geq 0\}$ and $\bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(y) : n \geq 0\}$ are infinite. Suppose $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has shadowing property, then there exists $\delta \in \mathcal{K}$ such that every $\delta-$pseudo orbit has a $\gamma_{\{x,y\}}-$shadowing point. There exists finite subset A of $F \setminus \{b\}$ such that $\gamma_A \subseteq \delta$. Choose $N \geq 1$ with

$$A \cap \{\mathfrak{h}^n(x) : n \geq 0\} \subseteq \{\mathfrak{h}^n(x) : 0 \leq n \leq N\}\,,$$

$$A \cap (\bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(y) : n \geq 0\}) \subseteq \bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(y) : 0 \leq n \leq N\}\,.$$

Let's mention that$\{\mathfrak{h}^n(x)\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a one-to-one sequence since $\{\mathfrak{h}^n(x) : n \geq 0\}$ is infinite. On the other hand for all $m \geq 0$, $\bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(y) : n \geq 0\}$ is infinite and $\bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(y) : 0 \leq n \leq m\}$ is finite (for all $u \in F \setminus \{b\}$, $\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(u)$ is finite), so $\bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(y) :$

$n \geq 0\} \neq \bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(y) : 0 \leq n \leq m\}$ which leads to $\mathfrak{h}^{-(m+1)}(y) \setminus \bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(y) : 0 \leq n \leq m\} \neq \varnothing$. Choose

$$w \in \mathfrak{h}^{-(N+2)}(y) \setminus \bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(y) : 0 \leq n \leq N+1\}.$$

Consider the following sequence:

$$x_0 = x, x_1 = \mathfrak{h}(x), \ldots, x_N = \mathfrak{h}^N(x), x_{N+1} = w, x_{N+2} = \mathfrak{h}(w), x_{N+3} = \mathfrak{h}^2(w), \ldots$$

since $\mathfrak{h}^{N+1}(x), w \notin A$, we have $(\mathfrak{h}(x_N), x_{N+1}) = (\mathfrak{h}^{N+1}(x), w) \in \gamma_A$ and $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a γ_A-pseudo orbit and it has a $\gamma_{\{x,y\}}$shadowing point say z. So for all $i \geq 0$, $(\mathfrak{h}^i(z), x_i) \in \gamma_{\{x,y\}}$, in particular $(z, x) = (\mathfrak{h}^0(z), x_0) \in \gamma_{\{x,y\}}$ and $(\mathfrak{h}^{2N+3}(z), y) = (\mathfrak{h}^{2N+3}(z), x_{2N+3}) \in \gamma_{\{x,y\}}$, which leads to $y = \mathfrak{h}^{2N+3}(z) = \mathfrak{h}^{2N+3}(x)$,

$$y_0 = x, \ldots, y_N = \mathfrak{h}^N(x), y_{N+1} = w, y_{N+2} = w, y_{N+3} = \mathfrak{h}(w), y_{N+4} = \mathfrak{h}^2(w), \ldots$$

since $\mathfrak{h}^{N+1}(x), w, \mathfrak{h}(w) \notin A$, the sequence $\{y_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a γ_A-pseudo orbit and it has a $\gamma_{\{x,y\}}-$shadowing point say z'. Using a similar method described above, $y = \mathfrak{h}^{2N+4}(z') = \mathfrak{h}^{2N+4}(x)$. Thus $\mathfrak{h}^{2N+3}(x) = \mathfrak{h}^{2N+4}(x)$ which is in contradiction with the fact that $\{\mathfrak{h}^n(x) : n \geq 0\}$ is infiniteness. Therefore $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ does not have shadowing property. □

Lemma 3.14. Let $\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(b) = \{b\}$, $F \setminus \{b\} \subseteq F_{\uparrow \text{fin}}$, and E is a finite subset of $F \setminus \{b\}$ such that $(E \cup \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(E))_{\downarrow \text{fin}} \cup \mathfrak{h}(E) \subseteq E$ and, then every γ_E- pseudo orbit has a γ_E-shadowing point.

Proof. Suppose that $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a γ_E- pseudo orbit.
Case I. $\{x_n : n \geq 0\} \cap E = \varnothing$. In this case we show that b is an $\alpha-$ shadowing point of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$. For all $n \geq 0$, $x_n \notin E$, moreover $b \notin E$, so $(\mathfrak{h}^n(b), x_n) = (b, x_n) \in \gamma_E \subseteq \gamma_A \subseteq \alpha$ and b is an $\alpha-$shadowing point of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$.
Case II. $x_0 \in E$. We prove x_0 is a γ_E-shadowing point of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$. First note that $x_0 \in E_{\uparrow \text{fin}}$, thus $\{\mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) : n \geq 0\} \subseteq E_{\uparrow \text{fin}} \subseteq E$. It's clear that $\mathfrak{h}^0(x_0) = x_0$, for $k \geq 0$ if $\mathfrak{h}^k(x_0) = x_k$, then $(\mathfrak{h}^{k+1}(x_0), x_{k+1}) = (\mathfrak{h}(x_k), x_{k+1}) \in \gamma_E$, using $\mathfrak{h}^{k+1}(x_0) \in E$, $\mathfrak{h}^{k+1}(x_0) = x_{k+1}$. Using induction we have $\mathfrak{h}^n(x_0) = x_n$ and $(\mathfrak{h}^n(x_0), x_n) = (x_n, x_n) \in \gamma_E$ for all $n \geq 0$, so x_0 is a γ_E-shadowing point of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$.
Case III. $\{x_n : n \geq 0\} \cap E \neq \varnothing$ and $p := \min\{n \geq 0 : x_n \in E\} \geq 1$. In this case $(\mathfrak{h}(x_{p-1}), x_p) \in \gamma_E$, and $\mathfrak{h}(x_{p-1}) = x_p$ since $x_p \in E$ thus $x_{p-1} \in \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(x_p) \subseteq \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(E)$, so $x_{p-1} \in \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(E) \setminus E \subseteq \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(E) \setminus \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(E)_{\downarrow \text{fin}}$, thus $\bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x_{p-1}) : n \geq 0\}$ is infinite. Choose $z \in \mathfrak{h}^{-(p-1)}(x_{p-1})$ (note that $\bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x_{p-1}) : n \geq 0\}$ is infinite and $\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x_{p-1}) : 0 \leq n \leq p-1\}$ is finite, thus $\mathfrak{h}^{-(p-1)}(x_{p-1}) \neq \varnothing$). Using Case II, x_p is a γ_E-shadowing point of $\{x_{n+p}\}_{n\geq 0}$ and for all $n \geq 0$,$\mathfrak{h}^n(x_p) = x_{n+p}$. On the other hand for all $i \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\}$, if $\mathfrak{h}^i(z) \in E$, then $x_{p-1} = \mathfrak{h}^{p-1}(z) \in \{\mathfrak{h}^n(\mathfrak{h}^i(z)) : n \geq 0\} \subseteq E$ which is a contradiction (since $x_{p-1} \notin E$), therefore $\mathfrak{h}^i(z) \notin E$.
For all $i < p$, $\mathfrak{h}^i(z), x_i \notin E$, so $(\mathfrak{h}^i(z), x_i) \in \gamma_E$. Moreover for all $i \geq p$, $(\mathfrak{h}^i(z), x_i) = (\mathfrak{h}^{i-p}(x_p), x_i) = (x_i, x_i) \in \gamma_E$. Thus z is a γ_E-shadowing point of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$.
Using the above two cases $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ has a γ_E-shadowing point. □

Theorem 3.15. Let $\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(b) = \{b\}$. The dynamical system $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has shadowing property if and only if $F \setminus \{b\} \subseteq F_{\downarrow \text{fin}}$ or $F \setminus \{b\} \subseteq F_{\uparrow \text{fin}}$.

Proof. If $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has shadowing property, then by Lemma 3.13, $F \setminus \{b\} \subseteq F_{\downarrow \text{fin}}$ or $F \setminus \{b\} \subseteq F_{\uparrow \text{fin}}$.
Conversely, if $F \setminus \{b\} \subseteq F_{\downarrow \text{fin}}$, then by Lemma 3.11, $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has shadowing property.

On the other hand if $F \setminus \{b\} \subseteq F_{\uparrow \text{fin}}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}$, then there exists a finite subset A of $F \setminus \{b\}$ with $\gamma_A \subseteq \alpha$. Let $H := \bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^n(A) : n \geq 0\}$ and $E := H \cup (H \cup \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(H))_{\downarrow \text{fin}}$, then for all $x \in E$ we have the following cases:

1. $x \in H$. Thus $\mathfrak{h}(x) \in \mathfrak{h}(H) \subseteq H \subseteq E$.
2. $x \in (H \cup \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(H))_{\downarrow \text{fin}}$. So there exists $y \in H \cup \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(H)$ with finite $\bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(y) : n \geq 0\}$ and $x \in \bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(y) : n \geq 0\}$. There exists $m \geq 0$ with $x \in \mathfrak{h}^{-m}(y)$. If $m \geq 1$, then $\mathfrak{h}(x) \in \mathfrak{h}^{-(m-1)}(y) \subseteq \bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(y) : n \geq 0\} \subseteq (H \cup \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(H))_{\downarrow \text{fin}} \subseteq E$. Otherwise, $m = 0$ and $x = y (\in H \cup \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(H))$, thus $\mathfrak{h}(x) \in H \cup \mathfrak{h}(H) = H \subseteq E$.

Using (1) and (2), $\mathfrak{h}(E) \subseteq E$. Moreover (note that for all $C, D \subseteq F$, $(C \cup D)_{\downarrow \text{fin}} = C_{\downarrow \text{fin}} \cup D_{\downarrow \text{fin}}$ and $(C_{\downarrow \text{fin}})_{\downarrow \text{fin}} = C_{\downarrow \text{fin}}$):

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\downarrow \text{fin}} &= \big(H \cup (H \cup (H \cup \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(H))_{\downarrow \text{fin}})\big)_{\downarrow \text{fin}} \\ &= H_{\downarrow \text{fin}} \cup \big((H \cup \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(H))_{\downarrow \text{fin}})\big)_{\downarrow \text{fin}} \\ &= H_{\downarrow \text{fin}} \cup (H \cup \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(H))_{\downarrow \text{fin}} \\ &= (H \cup H \cup \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(H))_{\downarrow \text{fin}} = (H \cup \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(H))_{\downarrow \text{fin}} \subseteq E \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.14, every γ_E-pseudo orbit has a γ_E-shadowing point, using $\gamma_E \subseteq \gamma_A \subseteq \alpha$ every γ_E-pseudo orbit has an $\alpha-$shadowing point which completes the proof. □

Theorem 3.16. The dynamical system $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has shadowing property, if and only if one of the following conditions occurs:

a. $\mathfrak{h}(b) \neq b$,
b. $\mathfrak{h}(b) = b$ and for all $x \in F \setminus \{b\}$, $\bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x) : n \geq 0\}$ is finite,
c. $\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(b) = \{b\}$ and for all $x \in F$, $\{\mathfrak{h}^n(x) : n \geq 0\}$ is finite.

Proof. Use Theorems 3.8, 3.12 and 3.15. □

Corollary 3.17. For a one to one continuous $\mathfrak{h} : F \to F$ the following statements are equivalent:

- $Per(\mathfrak{h}) = F$,
- $Per(\mathfrak{h}) \supseteq F \setminus \{b\}$,
- $Per(\mathfrak{h})$ is a dense subset of $F \setminus \{b\}$,
- for all $x \in F \setminus \{b\}$, $\{\mathfrak{h}^n(x) : n \geq 0\}$ is finite,
- $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has shadowing property,
- $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ is P-chaotic.

4. Weak specification property

In this section we show that $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has weak specification property (almost weak specification property) if and only if $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ does not have any periodic point. Moreover $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has specification property, if and only if $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one to one without any periodic point. On the other hand $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has weak specification property (almost weak specification property) if and only if $\bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\}$ is singleton. Finally, $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has specification property if and only if F is singleton.

Lemma 4.1. If $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ has a periodic point, then the dynamical system $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ does not have almost weak specification property.

Proof. Suppose that λ is a periodic point of Γ, then there exists $m \geq 1$ with $\varphi^m(\lambda) = \lambda$. Choose distinct $p, q \in X$ and consider $\alpha := \alpha_{\{\lambda\}} \in \mathcal{U}$. If $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has almost weak specification property, then there exists $N_\alpha : \mathbb{Z}_+ \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that for all $l_1 \leq k_1 < l_2 \leq k_2$ with $l_2 - k_1 \geq N_\alpha(k_2 - l_2)$ there exists $x \in X^\Gamma$ with the property:

$$(\sigma^i_\varphi(x), \sigma^i_\varphi(y_j)) \in \alpha \, \forall j \in \{1, 2\} \forall i \in \{l_j, l_j + 1, \ldots, k_j\} \, ,$$

for $y_1 = (p)_{\theta\in\Gamma}$ and $y_2 = (q)_{\theta\in\Gamma}$. In particular for $l_1 = k_1 = 1, l_2 = N_\alpha(m)+2, k_2 = N_\alpha(m) + 2 + m$ there exists $(x_\theta)_{\theta\in\Gamma}$ such that:

$$((x_{\varphi(\theta)})_{\theta\in\Gamma}, (p)_{\theta\in\Gamma}) \in \alpha \, ,$$

and

$$((x_{\varphi^i(\theta)})_{\theta\in\Gamma}, (q)_{\theta\in\Gamma}) \in \alpha \, \forall i = N_\alpha(m) + 2, \ldots, N_\alpha(m) + 2 + m \, ,$$

which imply that $x_{\varphi(\lambda)} = p$ and $x_{\varphi^i(\lambda)} = q$ for all $i = N_\alpha(m)+2, \ldots, N_\alpha(m)+2+m$. Choose $j \in \{N_\alpha(m) + 2, \ldots, N_\alpha(m) + 2 + m\}$ such that there exists $n \geq 1$ with $j = nm+1$, thus $\varphi^j(\lambda) = \varphi(\lambda)$ and $q = x_{\varphi^j(\lambda)} = x_{\varphi(\lambda)} = p$ which is a contradiction with $p \neq q$. Therefore $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ does not have almost weak specification property. □

Note 4.2. For a map $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma$ we say $\alpha \sim_\varphi \beta$ if there exists $i, j \geq 0$ with $\varphi^i(\alpha) = \varphi^j(\beta)$. Then $\sim_\varphi$ is an equivalence relation on Γ.

Lemma 4.3. If $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ does not have any periodic point, then the dynamical system $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has weak specification property.

Proof. Suppose $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ does not have any periodic. For $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$ there exists a finite subset F of Γ with $\alpha_F \subseteq \alpha$. Also, there exist $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_m \in \Gamma$ and $N \geq 1$ such that $F \subseteq \bigcup\{\varphi^{-i}(\beta_j) : j = 1, \ldots, m, i = 0, \ldots, N\}$ and for all distinct $s, t \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, $\beta_s \not\sim_\varphi \beta_t$. Now consider $x_1 = (x^1_\theta)_{\theta\in\Gamma}, \ldots, x_k = (x^k_\theta)_{\theta\in\Gamma} \in X^\Gamma$ and $0 \leq i_1 \leq j_1 < i_2 \leq j_2 < \cdots < i_k \leq j_k$ with $i_{s+1} - j_s > N$ for all $s \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$. Choose $p \in X$ and define $z = (z_\theta)_{\theta\in\Gamma} \in X^\Gamma$ in the following way:

$$z_\theta = \begin{cases} x^s_{\varphi^t(\gamma)} & 1 \leq s \leq k \wedge i_s \leq t \leq j_s \wedge \gamma \in F \wedge \theta = \varphi^t(\gamma) \\ p & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

First of all note that z_θs are well-defined, otherwise there exist $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in F$, $s_1 < s_2$, and $t_1 < t_2$ with $i_{s_1} \leq t_1 \leq j_{s_1} < i_{s_2} \leq t_2 \leq j_{s_2}$ with $\varphi^{t_1}(\gamma_1) = \varphi^{t_2}(\gamma_2)$, thus $\gamma_1 \sim_\varphi \gamma_2$ and there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and $r_1, r_2 \in \{0, \ldots, N\}$ with $\varphi^{r_1}(\gamma_1) = \varphi^{r_2}(\gamma_2) = \beta_i$, so by $i_{s_2} - j_{s_1} \geq N$, $t_2 > N$ and $\varphi^{t_1}(\gamma_1) = \varphi^{t_2}(\gamma_2) = \varphi^{t_2-r_2}(\beta_i) = \varphi^{t_2-r_2+r_1}(\gamma_1)$. By $t_2 - r_2 + r_1 \geq t_2 - N \geq i_{s_2} - N > j_{s_1} \geq t_1$, we have $t_2 - r_2 + r_1 - t_1 > 0$ and $\varphi^{t_1}(\gamma_1)$ is a periodic point of φ, which is a contradiction, so z_θs are well-defined. It is easy to see that for all $s \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, $\gamma \in F$ and $i_s \leq t \leq j_s$ we have $x^s_{\varphi^t(\gamma)} = z_{\varphi^t(\gamma)}$, i.e. $(\sigma^t_\varphi(z), \sigma^t_\varphi(x^s)) \in \alpha_F \subseteq \alpha$, which completes the proof. □

Theorem 4.4. The following statements are equivalent:

- $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has weak specification property,
- $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has almost weak specification property,
- $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ does not have any periodic point.

Proof. Use Lemmas 4.1 and 4.3. □

Corollary 4.5. The following statements are equivalent:

1. $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has specification property,
2. $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one to one without any periodic point.

Proof. "(1) ⇒ (2)" Suppose $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has specification property, then for all $x \in X^\Gamma$ and open neighbourhood U of x there exists $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$ with $\alpha[x] \subseteq U$. Since $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has specification property, there exists a periodic point z of σ_φ with $(x, z) \in \alpha$, i.e. $z \in \alpha[x] \subseteq U$ and the collection of all periodic points of σ_φ is dense in X^Γ. By [4, Theorem 2.6] $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one to one and using Lemma 4.1 $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ does not have any periodic point.
"(2) ⇒ (1)" Suppose $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one to one without any periodic point. By using Theorem 4.4, we get that $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has weak specification property. Consider $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$, there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{U}$ with $\beta^{-1} \circ \beta \subseteq \alpha$, moreover since $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has weak specification property there exists $N \geq 1$ such that for all $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in X^\Gamma$ $(n \geq 2)$ and $0 \leq l_1 \leq k_1 < l_2 \leq k_2 < \ldots < l_n \leq k_n$ with $l_{i+1} - k_i \geq N$ (for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$) there exists $x \in X^\Gamma$ such that

$$(\sigma_\varphi^i(x), \sigma_\varphi^i(y_j)) \in \beta \, \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \forall i \in \{l_j, l_j + 1, \ldots, k_j\} \, .$$

Since $\sigma_\varphi : X^\Gamma \to X^\Gamma$ is uniformly continuous, there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{U}$ with:

$$(u, v) \in \mu \Rightarrow (\sigma_\varphi^i(u), \sigma_\varphi^i(v)) \in \beta \, (\forall i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k_n\} \, .$$

Since $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one to one, the collection of all periodic points of σ_φ is dense in X^Γ by [4, Theorem 2.6]. Hence there exists a periodic point z of σ_φ with $(x, z) \in \mu$, thus $(\sigma_\varphi^i(x), \sigma_\varphi^i(z)) \in \beta$ for all $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k_n\}$. Therefore $(\sigma_\varphi^i(z), \sigma_\varphi^i(y_j)) \in \beta^{-1} \circ \beta \subseteq \alpha$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $i \in \{l_j, l_j + 1, \ldots, k_j\}$, which completes the proof. □

Theorem 4.6. In the dynamical system $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ the following statements are equivalent:

a. the dynamical system $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has weak specification property,
b. the dynamical system $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has almost weak specification property,
c. $\bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\}$ is singleton.

Proof. It's evident that (a) implies (b).
(b) ⇒ (c): Suppose $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has almost weak specification property. Note that $\bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\} \neq \varnothing$ since F is a nonempty compact Hausdorff and $\mathfrak{h} : F \to F$ is continuous. If $\bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\}$ is not singleton, then there exist distinct points $z, y \in \bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\}$. We may suppose $z \neq b$. There exists $N_{\gamma_{\{z\}}} : \mathbb{Z}_+ \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{N_{\gamma_{\{z\}}}(n)}{n} = 0$ and for all $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in F$ and $0 \leq l_1 \leq k_1 < l_2 \leq k_2 < \ldots < l_n \leq k_n$ with $l_{i+1} - k_i \geq N_{\gamma_{\{z\}}}(k_{i+1} - l_{i+1})$ (for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$) there exists $x \in Z$ such that

$$(\mathfrak{h}^i(x), \mathfrak{h}^i(y_j)) \in \gamma_{\{z\}} \, \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \forall i \in \{l_j, l_j + 1, \ldots, k_j\} \, .$$

Let:

$$l_1 = k_1 = 0, l_2 = k_2 \geq N_{\gamma_{\{z\}}}(0) \, ,$$

Choose $w \in \mathfrak{h}^{-(l_2+1)}(z)$, hence there exists $x_1, x_2 \in F$ such that:

$$(x_1, z) = (\mathfrak{h}^{l_1}(x_1), \mathfrak{h}^{l_1}(z)), (\mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(x_1), z) = (\mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(x_1), \mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(\mathfrak{h}(w))) \in \gamma_{\{z\}} \, , \tag{4.1}$$

and:

$$(x_2, z) = (\mathfrak{h}^{l_1}(x_2), \mathfrak{h}^{l_1}(z)), (\mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(x_2), \mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(w)) \in \gamma_{\{z\}} \, . \tag{4.2}$$

By (4.1), $x_1 = z = \mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(x_1)$, thus $z = l^{l_2}(z)$. Considering (4.2) we have $x_2 = z$ and therefore $(z, \mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(w)) = (\mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(z), \mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(w)) = (\mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(x_2), \mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(w)) \in \gamma_{\{z\}}$, $z = \mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(w)$, which

leads to $\mathfrak{h}(z) = \mathfrak{h}^{l_2+1}(w) = z$.
Now consider an arbitrary point $y \in \bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\}$ and choose $v \in \mathfrak{h}^{-l_2}(y)$, there exists $x_3 \in F$ such that:

$$(x_3, z) = (\mathfrak{h}^{l_1}(x_3), \mathfrak{h}^{l_1}(z)), (\mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(x_3), y) = (\mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(x_3), \mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(v)) \in \gamma_{\{z\}} \,,$$

thus $x_3 = z$ and $(z, y) = (\mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(z), y) = (\mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(x_3), \mathfrak{h}^{l_2}(v)) \in \gamma_{\{z\}}$ which shows that $y = z$. Therefore $\bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\} = \{z\}$ which is in contradiction with $y \neq z$. Thus $\bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\}$ is singleton.
(c) $\Rightarrow$ (a): Suppose $\bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\}$ is singleton:
Case I: $\bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\} = \{b\}$. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}$. There exists finite subset A of $F \setminus \{b\}$ with $\gamma_A \subseteq \alpha$. For all $y \in A$ there exists $m_y \geq 1$ with $y \notin \mathfrak{h}^{m_y}(F)$, thus $\mathfrak{h}^{-m_y}(F) = \varnothing$. Let $m = \sum_{y \in A} m_y$, then $\mathfrak{h}^{-m}(A) = \varnothing$. So for all $n \geq m$, $\mathfrak{h}^n(F) \cap A = \varnothing$. Let $N_\alpha = m$, then for all $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in F$ and $0 \leq l_1 \leq k_1 < l_2 \leq k_2 < \ldots < l_n \leq k_n$ with $l_{i+1} - k_i \geq m$ (for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$), $m \leq l_2$. Thus for all $i \geq l_2 (\geq m)$ and $j \geq 2$, $\mathfrak{h}^i(y_1), \mathfrak{h}^i(y_j) \notin A$, so $(\mathfrak{h}^i(y_1), \mathfrak{h}^i(y_j)) \in \gamma_A \subseteq \alpha$. On the other hand for $0 \leq i \leq k_1$, $(\mathfrak{h}^i(y_1), \mathfrak{h}^i(y_1)) \in \gamma_A \subseteq \alpha$. Hence

$$(\mathfrak{h}^i(y_1), \mathfrak{h}^i(y_j)) \in \alpha \, \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \forall i \in \{l_j, l_j + 1, \ldots, k_j\} \,,$$

which completes the proof.
Case II: $\bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\} = \{c\}$ and $c \neq b$. In this case $\mathfrak{h}(b) \neq b$ and $\mathfrak{h}(F)$ is finite, so by $\bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\} = \{c\}$, there exists $m \geq 1$ such that:

$$\forall n \geq m \, (\mathfrak{h}^n(F) = \{c\}$$

Now for all $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in F$ and $0 \leq l_1 \leq k_1 < l_2 \leq k_2 < \ldots < l_n \leq k_n$ with $l_{i+1} - k_i \geq m$ (for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$), $l_2 \geq m$ and $\mathfrak{h}^i(y_j) = \mathfrak{h}^i(y_1)$ for all $i \in \{l_j, \ldots, k_j\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Thus $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has weak specification property. □

Theorem 4.7. The dynamical system $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has specification property, if and only if $F = \{b\}$.

Proof. It's clear that for $F = \{b\}$, $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has specification property.
Conversely, suppose $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has specification property, then it has weak specification property. By Theorem 4.6, $\bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\}$ is singleton. For $z \in F \setminus \{b\}$ there exists a periodic point $x \in F$ such that for $l_1 = 0$, $(x, z) = (\mathfrak{h}^{l_1}(x), \mathfrak{h}^{l_1}(z)) \in \gamma_{\{z\}}$ so $z = x$ and x is a periodic point of $\mathfrak{h}$. Thus

$$F \setminus \{b\} \subseteq Per(\mathfrak{h}) \subseteq \bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\} \,,$$

hence $F \setminus \{b\}$ has at most one element. Suppose that $F = \{x, b\}$. We may consider the following cases, for $x \neq b$:
Case I: $\bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\} = x \neq b$. In this case $\mathfrak{h}(x) = \mathfrak{h}(b) = x$. So $Per(f) = \{x\}$, thus for $l_1 = 0$, $(x, b) = (\mathfrak{h}^{l_0}(x), \mathfrak{h}^{l_0}(b)) \in \gamma_{\{x\}}$ which leads to the contradiction $x = b$, hence this case does not occur.
Case II: $\bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\} = b \neq x$. In this case $\mathfrak{h}(x) = \mathfrak{h}(b) = b$. So $Per(f) = \{b\}$, thus for $l_1 = 0$, $(x, b) = (\mathfrak{h}^{l_0}(x), \mathfrak{h}^{l_0}(b)) \in \gamma_{\{x\}}$ which leads to the contradiction $x = b$, hence this case does not occur.
Considering the above cases, we get $x = b$ and $F = \{b\}$. □

5. Stroboscopical property

In this section we show that $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has uniform stroboscopical property, (stroboscopical property) if and only if $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one to one. Also $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has uniform stroboscopical property (stroboscopical property) if and only if all points of F are periodic points of $\mathfrak{h}$.

Lemma 5.1. If $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has stroboscopical property, then $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one to one.

Proof. Suppose $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is not one to one, then there are distinct points $\beta, \lambda \in \Gamma$ such that $\varphi(\beta) = \varphi(\lambda)$. Choose distinct $p, q \in X$. Consider $z = (z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Gamma} \in X^\Gamma$ with:

$$z_\alpha = \begin{cases} p & \alpha = \beta\,, \\ q & \text{otherwise}\,. \end{cases}$$

then for all $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Gamma} \in X^\Gamma$ and $n \geq 1$, $x_{\varphi^n(\beta)} = x_{\varphi^n(\lambda)}$. Thus there is not any sequence $\{n_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ in $\mathbb{N}$ with $\lim_{i\to\infty} \sigma_\varphi^{n_i}((x_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Gamma}) = z$. Therefore $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ does not have stroboscopical property. □

Lemma 5.2. If $A = \{m_i^1\}_{i\geq 0}$ is a strictly increasing sequence in $\mathbb{N}$, then:

1. there exists a map $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, and A has a subsequence $\{n_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ such that for all $m \geq 1$ and $i \geq m$, $n_i \equiv f(m) \pmod m$ and $f(m) \leq m$;
2. A has a subsequence $\{m_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ such that $m_{i+1} - m_i > 2i$ for all $i \geq 0$.

Proof. **1.** Suppose $A = \{m_i^1\}_{i\geq 0} =: A_1$ and $k_1 = 1$, then there exists $k_2 \in \{1, 2\}$ and A has a subsequence $A_2 = \{m_i^2\}_{i\geq 0}$ such that for all $i \geq 0$, $m_i^2 \equiv k_2 (\mathrm{mod} 2)$. For $s \geq 2$, suppose that we have chosen subsequences $A_1 = \{m_i^1\}_{i\geq 0}, \ldots, A_s = \{m_i^s\}_{i\geq 0}$ and natural numbers $k_1, \ldots, k_s$. Then there exists $k_{s+1} \in \{1, \ldots, s+1\}$, and A_s has a subsequence $A_{s+1} = \{m_i^{s+1}\}_{i\geq 0}$ such that for all $i \geq 0$, $m_i^{s+1} \equiv k_{s+1} (\mathrm{mod}\, s+1)$. Let $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ with $f(i) = k_i$ $(i \geq 1)$ and subsequence $\{n_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ of A with $n_0 = m_0^1$ and $n_i = m_i^i$ for $i \geq 1$, then the map $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ and subsequence $\{n_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ of A satisfies (1).
2. We construct $\{m_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ inductively. Let $m_0 := m_0^1$, for $i \geq 0$ suppose we have chosen $m_i = m_{n_i}^1$ let $m_{i+1} := m_{n_i+2i+1}^1$. The the subsequence $\{m_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ of A satisfies (2). □

Lemma 5.3. If all points of Γ are periodic points of $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$, then $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has stroboscopical property.

Proof. Let A be a strictly increasing sequence in $\mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 5.2 there exists a map $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ and A has a subsequence $\{n_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ such that for all $m \geq 1$ and $i \geq m$, $n_i \equiv f(m) \pmod m$ and $f(m) \leq m$. Consider $z = (z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Gamma} \in X^\Gamma$. For all $\alpha \in \Gamma$ let $k_\alpha = \min\{n \geq 1 : \varphi^n(\alpha) = \alpha\}$ and $x_\alpha = z_{\varphi^{k_\alpha - f(k_\alpha)}(\alpha)}$. Then for all $\alpha \in \Gamma$ and $i \geq f(k_\alpha)$, $k_\alpha - f(k_\alpha) + n_i \equiv 0 \pmod{k_\alpha}$, so $\varphi^{k_\alpha - f(k_\alpha) + n_i}(\alpha) = \alpha$. Hence

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} x_{\varphi^{n_i}(\alpha)} = \lim_{i\to\infty} z_{\varphi^{k_\alpha - f(k_\alpha)+n_i}(\alpha)} = z_\alpha$$

for all $\alpha \in \Gamma$, thus $\lim_{i\to\infty} \sigma_\varphi^{n_i}((x_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Gamma}) = \lim_{i\to\infty} (x_{\varphi^{n_i}(\alpha)})_{\alpha\in\Gamma} = (z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Gamma}$, which completes the proof. □

Remark 5.4. If $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one to one, then each $D \in \frac{\Gamma}{\sim_\varphi} (= \{\frac{\alpha}{\sim_\varphi} : \alpha \in \Gamma\})$ satisfies exactly one of the following conditions:

- D has finite elements like m and for all $\alpha \in D$, $D = \{\varphi^i(\alpha) : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$,
- D is infinite and there exists $\alpha \in \Gamma$ with $D = \{\varphi^n(\alpha) : n \geq 0\}$,
- D is infinite and we may suppose that $D = \{\beta_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with $\varphi(\beta_n) = \beta_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Lemma 5.5. If $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one to one and does not have any periodic point, then $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has stroboscopical property.

Proof. Suppose $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is a one to one map without any periodic point. Using axiom of choice there exists a subset of Γ like Λ such that $\bigcup\{\frac{\alpha}{\sim_\varphi} : \alpha \in \Lambda\} = \Gamma$ and for all distinct $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$, $\frac{\alpha}{\sim_\varphi} \cap \frac{\beta}{\sim_\varphi} = \varnothing$, also we may suppose each $\alpha \in \Lambda$ provides exactly one of the following conditions (use Remark 5.4 too):

- $\frac{\alpha}{\sim_\varphi} = \{\varphi^n(\alpha) : n \geq 0\}$,
- $\forall n \geq 0 \exists \beta \in \Gamma\ (\varphi^n(\beta)) = \alpha)$.

Moreover for all $\alpha \in \Gamma$, choose $\lambda_\alpha \in \Lambda \cap \frac{\alpha}{\sim_\varphi}$. Suppose A is a strictly increasing sequence in $\mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 5.2, A has a subsequence like $\{n_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ such that $n_{i+1} - n_i > 2i$ for all $i \geq 0$. Consider $p \in X$ and $z = (z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Gamma} \in X^\Gamma$, let:

$$x_\alpha = \begin{cases} z_{\varphi^j(\alpha)} & 0 \leq j < n_{i+1} - n_i, \alpha = \varphi^{n_i+j}(\lambda_\alpha), \frac{\lambda_\alpha}{\sim_\varphi} = \{\varphi^n(\lambda_\alpha) : n \geq 0\}\,, \\ z_{\varphi^j(\alpha)} & -i \leq j \leq i, \alpha = \varphi^{n_i+j}(\lambda_\alpha), (\forall n \geq 0(\varphi^{-n}(\lambda_\alpha) \neq \varnothing))\,, \\ p & \text{otherwise}\,. \end{cases}$$

One may verify that $\lim_{i\to\infty} \sigma_\varphi^{n_i}((x_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Gamma}) = (z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Gamma}$, which leads to the desired result. □

Theorem 5.6. The dynamical system $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has stroboscopical property if and only if $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one-to-one.

Proof. If $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has stroboscopical property, then by Lemma 5.1 the map $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one-to-one.
Now suppose $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one-to-one. If either all points of Γ are periodic points of φ or φ does not have any periodic point, then we are done by Lemmas 5.3 and 5.5. Otherwise $Per(\varphi)$ (the collection of all periodic points of φ) and $\Gamma \setminus Per(\varphi)$ are two nonempty subsets of Γ. By Lemmas 5.3 and 5.5 both dynamical systems $(X^{Per(\varphi)}, \sigma_{\varphi\restriction_{Per(\varphi)}})$ and $(X^{\Gamma\setminus Per(\varphi)}, \sigma_{\varphi\restriction_{\Gamma\setminus Per(\varphi)}})$ have stroboscopical property. In order to complete the proof use the fact that if both dynamical systems (Z, f) and (Y, h) have stroboscopical property, then $(Z \times Y, f \times h)$ (where $(f \times h)(u, v) = (f(u), h(v))$ for $(u, v) \in Z \times Y$) has stroboscopical property. □

Note 5.7. Using the proof of Lemmas 5.3 and 5.5 and Theorem 5.6, For finite discrete topological space X with at least two elements, nonempty set Γ, and arbitrary map $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ the following statements are equivalent:

- $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has uniform stroboscopical property,
- $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has stroboscopical property,
- $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one to one.

Note 5.8. For countable Γ, by [10, Proposition 5] and [4], $(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$ has the strong stroboscopical property if and only if $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is one to one without periodic points.

Theorem 5.9. The following statements are equivalent:

a. $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has uniform stroboscopical property,
b. $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has stroboscopical property,
c. $Per(\mathfrak{h}) = F$.

Proof. (b) $\Rightarrow$ (c). Suppose $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has stroboscopical property and z is an isolated point of F, then there exists $x \in F$ and $\{n\}_{n\geq 0}$ has a subsequence like $\{n_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathfrak{h}^{n_k}(x) = z$, hence there exists $N \geq 1$ such that:

$$\forall k \geq N \left(\mathfrak{h}^{n_k}(x) = z\right),$$

in particular $\mathfrak{h}^{n_N}(x) = z = \mathfrak{h}^{n_{N+1}}(x)$, thus $\mathfrak{h}^{n_{N+1}-n_N}(z) = z$ and $z \in Per(\mathfrak{h})$.
On the other hand, if z is limit point of F, then F is infinite and $z = b$. Since $F \setminus \{b\} \subseteq Per(\mathfrak{h})$, $\mathfrak{h} \restriction_{F\setminus\{b\}} : F \setminus \{b\} \to F$ is one-to-one which leads to $\mathfrak{h}(b) = b$ by Remark 3.6.
(c) $\Rightarrow$ (a). Suppose $Per(\mathfrak{h}) = F$ and A is an arbitrary increasing sequence in $\mathbb{N}$. The subsequences $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ of of A defined inductively as follows:

- let $A_1 := A = \{n_k^1\}_{k\geq 0}$ and $r_1 = 0$,
- suppose for $t \geq 1$, $A_t = \{n_k^t\}_{k\geq 0}$ is a subsequence of A and $r_t \in \{0, \ldots, t-1\}$ such that for all $k \geq 0$, $n_k^t \overset{\text{mod } t}{\equiv} r_t$; then there exists $r_{t+1} \in \{0, \ldots, t\}$ and subsequence $A_{t+1} = \{n_k^{t+1}\}_{k\geq 0}$ such $n_k^{t+1} \overset{\text{mod } t+1}{\equiv} r_{t+1}$.

Then $B := \{n_k^k\}_{k\geq 1}$ is a subsequence of A with

$$\forall t \geq 1 \forall k \geq t \left(n_k^k \overset{\text{mod } t}{\equiv} r_t\right).$$

For $z \in F$ let $m_z := \min\{m \geq 1 : \mathfrak{h}^m(z) = z\}$. Consider $\varrho : F \to F$ with $\varrho(z) = \mathfrak{h}^{m_z - r_{m_z}}(z)$ $(z \in F)$. Then for all $z \in Z$ and $k \geq m_z$, $\mathfrak{h}^{n_k^k}(\varrho(z)) = z$. For $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}$ there exists a finite subset A of $F \setminus \{b\}$ with $\gamma_A \subseteq \alpha$. Let $N = \max(\{m_z : z \in A\} \cup \{m_b\})$, for all $k \geq N$ and $z \in F$.

- $m_z \leq N$: in this case $\mathfrak{h}^{n_k^k}(\varrho(z)) = z$, and $(\mathfrak{h}^{n_k^k}(\varrho(z)), z) = (z, z) \in \alpha$.
- $m_z > N$: note that for all $i \geq 0$, $m_z = m_{\mathfrak{h}^i(z)}$, thus for all $n \geq N$ we have $m_{\mathfrak{h}^{n_k^k}(\varrho(z))} = m_{\mathfrak{h}^{n_k^k + m_z - r_{m_z}}(z)} = m_z > N$ therefore $z, \mathfrak{h}^{n_k^k}(\varrho(z)) \notin A$ and $(\mathfrak{h}^{n_k^k}(\varrho(z)), z) \in \gamma_A \subseteq \alpha$.

Regarding the above two cases we have $(\mathfrak{h}^{n_k^k}(\varrho(z)), z) = (\mathfrak{h}^{n_k^k}(\varrho(z)), id_F(z)) \in \alpha$ for all $k \geq N$. Thus $\{\mathfrak{h}^{n_k^k} \circ \varrho\}_{k\geq 1}$ converges uniformly to $id_F : F \to F$ and $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has uniform stroboscopical property. □

Theorem 5.10. The dynamical system $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has strongly stroboscopical property if and only if $F = \{b\}$.

Proof. Suppose $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has strongly stroboscopical property, if $F \neq \{b\}$, then F has at least two (distinct) isolated points like x, y. There exists $m \geq 1$ with $\mathfrak{h}^m(x) = x$, by Theorem 5.9, since $(F, \mathfrak{h})$ has strongly stroboscopical property and x is an isolated point of F, $y \in \omega_{\mathfrak{h}}(\{mn\}_{n\geq 0}, x) = \{x\}$ which is in contradiction with $y \neq x$, thus $F = \{b\}$. □

6. Two diagrams

Let's recall that inthe paper, X is a finite discrete space with at least two elements, Γ is nonempty, $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is an arbitrary map, F is a Fort space with particular point b, and $\mathfrak{h} : F \to F$ is continuous. So according to the previous sections, we get the following table:

ρ \ (Z, f)	$(X^\Gamma, \sigma_\varphi)$	$(F, \mathfrak{h})$
shadowing		"$\mathfrak{h}(b) \neq b$" or " for all $x \in F \setminus \{b\}$, $\bigcup\{\mathfrak{h}^{-n}(x) : n \geq 0\}$ is finite" or "$\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(b) = \{b\}$ and for all $x \neq b$, $\{\mathfrak{h}^n(x) : n \geq 0\}$ is finite"
almost weak specification / weak specification	$Per(\varphi) = \varnothing$	$\bigcap\{\mathfrak{h}^n(F) : n \geq 1\}$ is singleton
uniform stroboscopical / stroboscopical	φ is one-to-one	$Per(\mathfrak{h}) = F$
specification / strongly stroboscopical	$Per(\varphi) = \varnothing$ and φ is one-to-one	$F = \{b\}$

Table A

Where the dynamical system (Z, f) has ρ property if and only if it has the phrase occurs in the corresponding case.
Using Table A, we have the following diagrams:



Where (Ci) denotes the counterexample $(X^{\mathbb{Z}}, \sigma_{\varphi_i})$ for:

- $\varphi_1 : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ with $\varphi_1(n) = n^2$ $(n \in \mathbb{Z})$,
- $\varphi_2 : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ with $\varphi_2(n) = n^2 + 1$ $(n \in \mathbb{Z})$,
- $\varphi_3 : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ with $\varphi_3(n) = -n$ $(n \in \mathbb{Z})$,
- $\varphi_4 : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ with $\varphi_4(n) = n + 1$ $(n \in \mathbb{Z})$.

And:



Where (Di) denotes the counterexample $(\{\frac{\pm 1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}\} \cup \{0\}, \mathfrak{h}_i)$ for (consider $\{\frac{\pm 1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}\} \cup \{0\}$ with induced topology from Euclidean line $\mathbb{R}$):

$$\mathfrak{h}_1(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{x-1} & x \neq 1\,, \\ 0 & x = 1\,, \end{cases} \quad \mathfrak{h}_2(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{x+1} & x \geq 0\,, \\ \frac{x}{x-1} & x \leq 0\,, \end{cases} \quad \mathfrak{h}_3(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{x-1} & 0 \leq x < 1\,, \\ \frac{x}{x+1} & -1 < x \leq 0\,, \\ x & x = \pm 1\,, \end{cases}$$

$$\mathfrak{h}_4(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{x-1} & x \neq 1\,, \\ -1 & x = 1\,, \end{cases} \quad \mathfrak{h}_5(x) = -x \left(x \in \{\tfrac{\pm 1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}\} \cup \{0\}\right).$$

References

[1] T. Arai, N. Chinen, *P-chaos implies distributional chaos and chaos in the sense of Devaney with positive topological entropy*, Topology and its Applications, 2007 (154), 1254–1262.

[2] F. Ayatollah Zadeh Shirazi, D. Dikranjan, *Set-theoretical entropy: A tool to compute topological entropy*, Proceedings ICTA 2011, Islamabad, Pakistan, July 4–10, 2011 (Cambridge Scientific Publishers), (2012), 11–32.

[3] F. Ayatollah Zadeh Shirazi, N. Karami Kabir, F. Heidari Ardi, *A Note on shift theory*, Mathematica Pannonica, Proceedings of ITES–2007, **19/2** (2008), 187–195.

[4] F. Ayatollah Zadeh Shirazi, J. Nazarian Sarkooh, B. Taherkhani, *On Devaney chaotic generalized shift dynamical systems*, Studia Scientiarum Mathematicarum Hungarica, 2013 (50, no. 4), 509–522.

[5] J. Banks, J. Brooks, G. Cairns, G. Davis, P. Stacey, *On Devaney, definition of chaos*, The American Mathematical Monthly, 1992 (99/4), 332–334.

[6] T. Ceccherini–Silberstein, M. Coornaert, *Sensitivity and Devaney's chaos in uniform spaces*, Journal of Dynamical and Control Systems, 2013 (19, No. 3), 349–357.

[7] M. Dateyama, *The almost weak specification property for ergodic group automorphisms of abelian groups*, J. Math. Soc. Japan, 1990 (Vol. 42, No. 2), 341–351.

[8] J. Dugundji, *Topology*, Allyn and Bacon, Inc. Boston, 1966.

[9] A. Giordano Bruno, *Algebraic entropy of generalized shifts on direct products*, Communications in Algebra, **38/11** (2010), 4155–4174.

[10] V. Jimenez Lopez, L. Snoha, *Stroboscopical property in topological dynamics*, Topology and its Applications, 2003 (129), 301–316.

[11] J. I. Kelley, *General Topology*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, 1975.

[12] S. Yu. Pilyugin, *Shadowing In dynamical Systems*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **1706**, Springer-Verlage, Berlin, 1999.

[13] L. A. Steen, J. A. Seebach, *Counterexamples in topology*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc, New York, 1970.

[14] P. Walters, *On the pseudo orbit tracing property and its relationship to stability*, Lecture notes in mathematics, 1978 (663/ no. 1), 231–244.

[15] P. Walters, *An introruction to ergodic theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **79**, Springer-Verlag, 1982.
[16] X. Yang, *The chain recurrent set for selfmaps of a compact uniform space*, Northeast. Math. Journal, 1992 (8/ no. 1), 83–88.

Fatemah Ayatollah Zadeh Shirazi, Faculty of Mthematics, Statistics and Computer Science, College of Science, University of Tehran, Enghelab Ave., Tehran, Iran
E-mail address: fatemah@khayam.ut.ac.ir

Zahra Nili Ahmadabadi, Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Iran
E-mail address: zahra.nili.a@gmail.com

Bahman Taherkhani, Department of Mathematics, Payame Noor University, P.O.Box 19395-3697, Tehran, Iran
E-mail address: bahman.taherkhani@pnu.ac.ir

Khosro Tajbakhsh, Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematical Sciences, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran 14115-134, Iran
E-mail address: khtajbakhsh@modares.ac.ir , arash@cnu.ac.kr